

## NORTH CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL COMMISSION

1050 NORTHGATE DRIVE, SUITE 130  
SAN RAFAEL, CALIFORNIA 94903 - (415) 472-4321

June 14, 1978

## MEMORANDUM

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY*Coastal zone mgmt --  
CMT -- Sonoma Co.,  
JUN 16 1978*

TO: Regional Commissioners and Interested Parties

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

FROM: Kenneth A. Cristofani, Coastal Planner

SUBJECT: Commission Review of Sonoma County LCP Work Program

The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors has adopted and submitted its proposed Local Coastal Program Work Program, May 1978. This work program identifies the major coastal planning issues perceived by the County, and proposes a series of studies to address and resolve those issues. The program has been submitted for Commission review and approval as required for a grant of planning funds from the State Coastal Commission.

Two public hearings before the Regional Commission have been scheduled:

Hearing #1: June 22, 1978, 6:00 PM  
Board of Supervisors Meeting Chambers  
Sonoma County Administration Bldg. Santa Rosa

Hearing #2: July 20, 1978, 7:00 PM  
Planning Commission Meeting Room  
Sonoma County Administration Bldg., Santa Rosa

The first of the public hearings will consist of a review and evaluation of the County's issue identification and substantive work tasks, and the estimated budget for those tasks. These items include all the actual planning studies and preparation of the land use plan. The second public hearing will focus on the general organizational and administrative aspects of the program, including the provisions for public participation. It will also serve as a review session for any topics not covered or completed at the initial hearing. Copies of the staff reports for these hearings are available on request from the Regional Commission office.

Following these two public hearings, the Regional Commission's recommendations for the Work Program will be transmitted to the State Commission. The State Commission will hold a public hearing in early August, at which time final decisions will be made on issues, tasks, and budget, and a grant of funds will be approved.

The proposed Work Program includes those items which the County, on its initiative, has concluded are necessary and desirable for a complete LCP. The Commission's review responsibilities are difficult ones. It must assure



that all significant issues are identified, that the tasks adequately address the issues, and that the budget correctly reflects the cost of completing the accepted work. Given the extremely limited LCP funds, only items essential for a certified LCP can be funded. The recommended work program revisions represent the Commission's response to effectively utilize those funds.

The County's Issue Identification identifies many coastal planning issues. Broadly grouped, they fall into the categories of coastal access and recreational development; transportation; natural resources; agriculture and forestry; public services; and housing and new development. These are the key issues in Sonoma County, with the first four of top priority. Although some individual issues were not clearly described and a few were omitted, the Issue Identification is acceptable. Specific editorial revisions are outlined in the staff report. No major changes are proposed.

About a hundred substantive planning tasks are presented under work groups A through N, and Q. Because of organizational format there is a great deal of inadvertent repetition in these tasks. Some tasks are non-essential, and a few duplicated General Plan work. The County requested \$74,879.92 for completion of the tasks, excluding overhead and administrative expenses. The staff report recommends \$41,638.64 for the tasks which have been identified as essential for a certifiable land use plan. Major revisions and budget cuts are recommended for the following work groups: housing; water and marine resources; environmentally sensitive habitat areas; public works; and data collection and mapping.

A preliminary review of the citizen and agency participation program and the administrative element indicates significant overlap between their task and budget proposals and with the tasks just reviewed. The general objectives, however, are appropriate. The County's formula for overhead charges and other administrative costs, currently unsubstantiated, may be revised pending further analysis.

The fundamental direction of the County's program, as evidenced by its identified objectives and specified end products, is good. Effective organization and administration of the program are now the Commission's goals. Your comments, written and/or verbal are welcomed.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123306099

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES LIBRARY

MAY 17 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

78 02988